

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 2, 3, 17, 20-24 and 30 have been canceled and claims 1, 4, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 25-28 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-6 of the Reply. Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Pesin for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted on May 20, 2008. The distinctions between the cited references and the claims were discussed. However, no agreement was reached. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-15, 20 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-15, 20 and 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 20 and 30 have been canceled herein. In addition, independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite a useful, concrete and tangible result. In light of the amendments, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 10-13, 16, 18-28 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-4, 6, 10-13, 16, 18-28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Clauss *et al.* (U.S. 6,565,608). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Clauss *et al.* does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim.*** *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The ***identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*** *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicant's claimed invention relates to facilitating designation of appropriate responses to system events. Upon the occurrence of a system event, message components are received. Message components include a plurality of messages specifying context and a rationale relating to the event and/or an aspect of the event. (See Summary). In particular, independent claim 1 recites *a computer-implemented interactive user messaging system comprising, a processor coupled to memory that retains: a receiver component that receives a message component corresponding to an event, the event includes at least one of an error, a determinations of potential for an error, or an information prompt, the message component includes a plurality of messages, each message from the plurality of messages relates to at least a part of the event, the message component hierarchically organizes the plurality of messages from a high level description of the event to a low level description of the event, each message of the plurality of messages comprises a context component that provides a user context regarding an operational source of the message and a rationale component that provides a reason for the message and an assist component that provides a plurality of menu items corresponding to respective messages in the plurality of messages of the message component, each menu item includes a link to an informational source that provides at least one of information or a corrective action associated with the corresponding message, the corresponding message is highlighted as a user hovers on a respective menu item.* Similarly, independent claim 13 recites *means for associating menu items with respective messages, the menu items provide at least one of information or a corrective action associated with the messages* and independent claim 16 recites *generating menu items associated with each message in the list of messages, the menu items include at least one of information or a corrective action associated with the messages.* Clauss *et al.* does not disclose, teach or suggest such aspects.

Clauss *et al.* relates to a processing and representing error messages within a computer-aided design environment. A function that results in an error when executing stores the error in a central storage location. Any calling functions that called the failed function do not add its own error message to the storage location. (See col. 4, ll. 7-42). The error is displayed in a hierarchical manner where each level of the display hierarchy is a different level of information. (See col. 6, ll. 1-3). While the display includes a help

button (*See* 422, 472 and 540 of Figs. 4 and 5), the button is a mechanism to enable a user to request additional help (*See* col. 5, ll. 44-47 and col. 6, ll. 38-40). In the claimed subject matter, a plurality of menu items are provided corresponding to each respective message of the plurality of messages. The menu items provide information or a corrective action. A help button is not a plurality of menu items but rather a mechanism to assert a request for additional information. Moreover, the help button does not provide a list of menu items corresponding to the message displayed. Rather, the help button remains constant regardless of the error information presented.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Clauss *et al.*, neither discloses, teaches nor suggests, each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 16 (and associated dependent claims). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Clauss *et al.* does not anticipate the applicant's claimed invention and, therefore, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clauss *et al.* in view of Pangburn (U.S. 7,152,226). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. Pangburn does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7, 8, 14 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 8, 14 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clauss *et al.* in view of Pittore (U.S. 6,414,699). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 7, 8, 14 and 29 depend from independent claims 1 and 16, respectively and Pittore does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 16.

V. Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clauss *et al.* in view of Boulton *et al.* (U.S. 5,566,291). It is respectfully requested that this

rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1. Boulton *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1.

VI. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clauss *et al.* in view of Spellman *et al.* (U.S. 6,667,747). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 15 depends from independent claim 13 and Spellman *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss *et al.* with respect to independent claim 13.

VII. Rejection of Claim 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Clauss *et al.* in view of Smith *et al.* (U.S. 5,678,013). Claim 17 has been cancelled. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP618US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Amin, Turocy & Calvin, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

Amin, Turocy & Calvin, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731